

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 9-10, 14, 19, 22 and 24 are amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

A. Statement of the Substance of the Interview.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by Examiner Vu and SPE Kincaid to Applicant's representative, John Ciccozzi, during a November 13, 2003 personal interview. The substance of the personal interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

During the interview, claim 1 and other rejected independent claims as well as newly presented independent claims were argued to be allowable. For example, Applicant argued Ubillos fails to disclose at least a feature of a multi-level position/range designating method for a multimedia stream comprising displaying an entire range of a multimedia stream and setting a range designated by a user from the displayed entire range of the multimedia stream as an absolute range of the multimedia stream and displaying the absolute range of the multimedia

stream (as the entire range of the multimedia stream) if a range is designated by the user and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1. Further, the Examiners explained and clarified their position on the disclosure of Ubillos. However, no agreement was reached, although possible amendments for clarification were discussed.

No exhibit was presented or demonstration conducted during the interview.

Applicant respectfully requests that this paper be included in the record for purposes of satisfying the requirements under MPEP §713.04.

B. The Office Action rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits the above amendments obviate the grounds for the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

C. The Office Action rejects claims 1-17, 20-21 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,999,173 to Ubillos. The Office Action further rejects claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ubillos and U.S. Patent No. 6,469,711 to Foreman et al. (hereafter "Foreman"). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits Ubillos does not disclose every claimed feature as required under 35 U.S.C. §102. For example, Applicant respectfully submits Ubillos fails to disclose at least features of a multi-level position/range designating method including (a) displaying an entire first range of a multimedia stream, and (b) setting a second range designated by a user from the displayed entire first range of the multimedia stream as an absolute range of the multimedia stream and displaying the absolute range of the multimedia

Reply to Office Action of September 10, 2003

stream as the entire range of the multimedia stream, if the second range is designated by the user, wherein each level and sublevel of the multi-level position/range designation method maintains the same temporal reference frame period and combinations thereof as recited. Further, Applicant respectfully submits Ubillos does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of displaying and setting, wherein each level and sublevel maintains the same temporal reference frame period and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Foreman does not teach or suggest at least features of claim 1 lacking from Ubillos. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Ubillos and Foreman, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of displaying and setting, wherein each level and sublevel maintains the same temporal reference frame period and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 9, 14 and 24 define patentable subject matter for least reasons similar to claim 1. Claims 2-8, 10-13, 15-21 and 25, depend from claims 1, 9, 14 and 24, respectively, and therefore also define patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as their additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17, 20-21 and 24-25 under §102 and claims 18-19 under §103 is respectfully requested.

D. The Office Action rejects claims 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,956,026 to Ratakonda. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 22, Applicant respectfully submits Ratakonda does not disclose every claimed feature as required under 35 U.S.C. §102. For example, Ratakonda fails to disclose at least features of a multi-level position/range designating method for a multimedia stream including a multiple level representation of a multimedia stream, wherein each level displays a more detailed but shorter range of the multimedia stream to achieve a refined range designation using more detailed views and a continuous subset of data from a previous level of the multimedia stream, wherein each level and a designated range of the previous level of the multi-level position/range designation method maintains the same temporal reference frame period, and wherein said each level is displayed with the same absolute range and combinations thereof as recited. Further, Applicant respectfully submits Ratakonda does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of wherein each level in a designated range is a previous level maintains the same temporal reference range and combinations thereof as recited in claim 22.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 22 defines patentable subject matter. Claim 23 depends from claim 22 and therefore also defines patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as its additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22-23 under §102 is respectfully requested.

E. Applicant respectfully submits the above amendments to the independent claims 1, 9, 22 and 24 are for clarity and do not narrow the scope of the claims under *Festo*.

Serial No. 09/703,608
Reply to Office Action of September 10, 2003

Docket No. CIT/K-132

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Carl R. Wesolowski**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703-766-3701 DYK/CRW:jld
Date: December 10, 2003

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610